Preparatory Committee for the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

19 September 2002

Original: English

Summary record of the 18th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 18 April 2002, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Salander ..... (Sweden)

Contents

Organization of the 2005 Review Conference

(a) Dates and venue

(d) Appointment of the Secretary-General of the Conference

(f) Financing of the Review Conference, including its Preparatory Committee

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

02-34240 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Organization of the 2005 Review Conference

(a) Dates and venue

1. **The Chairman** said he took it that the Committee wished to provisionally agree to hold the 2005 Review Conference from 2-27 May 2005 in New York and to reconfirm that decision at a later session, once a calendar of meetings for 2005 became available.

2. *It was so decided.*

(d) Appointment of the Secretary-General of the Conference

3. **The Chairman** said that he took it that the Committee wished to invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in consultation with the members of the Committee, to nominate an official to act as provisional Secretary-General of the Conference, as in the past. The functions of the post would be outlined in the rules of procedure of the Conference, and the nomination would be confirmed by the Conference itself.

4. *It was so decided.*

(f) Financing of the Review Conference, including its Preparatory Committee

5. **The Chairman** said that the financing of the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its preparatory process would be borne by States parties to the Treaty and that there would accordingly be no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. He had also been informed that the services required for the sessions of the Preparatory Committee and the Conference itself could only be provided by the Secretariat if the necessary funds were received in advance.

6. He took it that the Committee wished to request the Secretariat to provide for its second session an estimate of the costs of the 2005 Review Conference, including its Preparatory Committee.

7. *It was so decided.*

8. **The Chairman** invited delegations to address issues related to the organization of the 2005 Review Conference and future sessions of the Preparatory Committee.

9. **Mr. Westdal** (Canada) recalled that in step 12 of the 13 practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference, States parties had agreed to report on their implementation of article VI of the Treaty and paragraph 4 (c) of the 1995 decision on "Principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament". Since transparency was essential to accountability, step 12 was important to the development of permanence with accountability. Clearly, however, there was a diversity of views on how the reporting requirement might best be fulfilled and additional time was thus required to address questions concerning the scope, frequency and format of reports. For that reason, his own delegation and several others had been considering the possibility of open-ended, informal consultations which could take place over the next year in Geneva. Their purpose would be to elaborate proposals concerning reporting concepts for consideration by the Preparatory Committee at its session in 2003. Such consultations would require no conference services, nor would it have any financial implications, except for member States wishing to despatch representatives.

10. **Mr. Heinsberg** (Germany) said that although the 2000 Final Document allowed States parties some flexibility in reporting, his delegation would welcome joint efforts to achieve a greater degree of common understanding on the issue. It would be keen to participate in the informal consultations proposed.

11. **Mr. Amano** (Japan) said that the Canadian proposal was all the more welcome given that the NPT lacked a permanent review mechanism. His delegation supported all efforts to further strengthen the review process. A further suggestion for maintaining the momentum generated by the current session would be to hold seminars involving governmental as well as non-governmental experts.

12. **Mr. Paus** (Norway), **Mr. Osei** (Ghana), **Mr. Persiani** (Italy), **Mr. Chindawongse** (Thailand), **Mr. Lint** (Belgium), **Mr. Soltanieh** (Islamic Republic of Iran), **Mr. Wiranataatmadja** (Indonesia), **Mr. Yun** Byung-se (Republic of Korea) and **Mr. El Kadiri** (Morocco) joined with previous speakers in expressing support for the proposal made by the representative of Canada.

13. **Mr. Friedrich** (Switzerland), also welcoming the Canadian proposal, said that a common understanding on reporting requirements would only strengthen the review process. It was important, however, to ensure that the consultations had no financial implications, required no conference services and created no precedent.

14. **Mr. Zischg** (Austria), expressing support for the proposal, said that it would facilitate elaboration of a more structured reporting mechanism. The reports submitted by States parties to the current session had varied considerably with respect to format, depth and scope, however his delegation had been gratified to learn how many countries had already implemented the Treaty.

15. **Mr. Mubarak** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, said that he welcomed the Canadian proposal in principle, but reserved the right to submit more detailed comments at the next meeting.

16. **Ms. Simons** (Canada) said that the strengthened review process, despite some initial difficulties, had made a good start. States parties had reaffirmed the value they attached to the NPT as the world's seminal non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament treaty. The Committee had demonstrated considerable efforts invested by States parties in implementing the Treaty and had also served to highlight the importance of fulfilling Treaty obligations. Her delegation wished, however, to suggest ways of further enhancing the review process.

17. Canada attached particular importance to the involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the review process. NGOs had made a particularly constructive contribution to the current session, providing valuable literature and organizing numerous parallel activities. The current arrangements — stemming from the enhanced review process and the 2000 Final Document — were operable and could be further enhanced in preparation for the 2005 Review Conference. While the responsibility for implementing the Treaty rested with Governments, all States parties could profit from wider input at various levels. NGOs had demonstrated their commitment to the Treaty; they clearly recognized that they had a collective responsibility to ensure an effectively coordinated participation. Her delegation would welcome suggestions on how NGO participation might be optimized and proposed to prepare a working paper for submission to the next Preparatory Committee session.

18. Although the wide engagement by States parties in discussions on a variety of issues was most welcome, the Committee might consider striving for shorter general statements and interventions in future, given time limitations. It would also be desirable to create opportunity for spontaneous exchanges.

19. The Preparatory Committee had benefited greatly from the Chairman's wide consultations prior to its commencement, and it was to be hoped that such practice would continue to be followed in future. The indicative timetable had proved its effectiveness, providing a basis which would facilitate the future work of the Committee.

20. Her delegation welcomed the commitment that had been demonstrated in the strengthened review process and looked forward to its being furthered.

21. **Mr. Broucher** (United Kingdom) said that he agreed with the previous speaker's assessment that the Conference had been most successful. The United Kingdom remained fully committed to the 2000 Final Document, including its provisions on regular reporting.

22. His delegation was not, however, convinced that the proposed informal consultations were desirable, the issue being highly contentious and thus likely to constitute a drain on time and resources. No one reporting format would do for all States parties, since reporting requirements varied. It was surely more important to focus on matters of substance.

23. **Mr. Deen** (Netherlands) expressed support for both statements made by the Canadian delegation. The Netherlands was keen to work with Canada and other States parties to enhance the active participation of NGOs in all issues related to the NPT and to further refine the reporting process.

24. **Mr. Ochoa Martínez** (Mexico) said that the constructive contribution of NGOs to the current session was proof of the usefulness of mutually enriching exchanges between States and civil society in the nuclear disarmament process. His delegation was also keen to collaborate in developing new ideas for optimizing NGO participation and in further strengthening the review process in preparation for the 2005 Review Conference.

25. **Mr. Paus** (Norway) expressed support for the Canadian proposal for optimizing NGO involvement. His delegation recognized the usefulness of having a public well-informed in matters relating to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and wished to emphasize the constructive contribution of NGOs to the review process.

26. **Mr. Caughley** (New Zealand) said that he also supported the Canadian suggestion. Civil society had a vested interest in seeing the fulfilment of the principles and objectives of the NPT, and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference indicated that 141 research institutes and NGOs had taken part in the event; their involvement in the review process was therefore very considerable. The Canadian initiative was fully consistent with the Secretary-General's efforts to encourage partnership between the United Nations, its Member States and representatives of civil society.

27. **Mr. Goosen** (South Africa) said that his country fully supported the statement made by the representative of Canada with regard to NGOs, since they made a valuable contribution to the Committee's discussions. Regarding the organization of the Preparatory Committee's work, the strengthened review process needed to be adapted continuously in order to make it more effective. A more interactive process should be introduced, so that members of the Committee could discuss proposals rather than make formal statements. It was probably due to the lack of interaction that various interesting proposals had been made, such as the one on reporting submitted by Canada earlier in the meeting; however, any follow-up could only be carried out through informal structures. A formal discussion should perhaps be held on ways to perfect the process.

28. **Mr. de La Fortelle** (France) said that he supported the position of the United Kingdom with regard to reporting. France intended to comply with the provisions of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference and respect its obligation to submit regular reports under article VI; nevertheless, it reserved the right to determine how and when such reports would be presented.

29. The participation of NGOs in Preparatory Committee sessions was useful and should continue.

30. **Mr. Wulf** (United States of America) said that any attempt to control the form, content and timing of reports was doomed to failure. He supported the involvement of NGOs, but was quite satisfied with the current rules.

31. **Mr. Heinsberg** (Germany) said that his country attached great importance to the participation of NGOs in the discussion process and looked forward to receiving the Canadian paper.

32. **Mr. Soltanieh** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that he hoped that the next Preparatory Committee session would be more interactive.

33. **Mr. Rowe** (Sierra Leone) said that he also supported interactive exchanges rather than formal statements. He welcomed NGO participation in the Committee's work as it provided a valuable contribution. However, rather than change the rules, it might be possible to organize informal sessions between the States parties and the NGOs.

The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 6 p.m.

34. **The Chairman** said that the factual summary that he had expected to circulate to members of the Committee at that time was delayed, but would be available at 8.15 p.m. It represented his best effort to summarize deliberations at the Preparatory Committee session, as requested by the decisions on the review process taken by States parties at the 2000 Review Conference. It was not a negotiated text and would not be negotiated or amended after circulation; it was issued entirely under his own responsibility. It would be annexed to the procedural report which the Committee would adopt the following day. If delegations wished to express support or reservations, they could do so after the procedural report had been adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.